

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed 03/21/2007, and further in view of the Examiner Interview conducted on 05/23/2007. Applicant is appreciative of the professional and courteous interview held with the Examiner, Ms. Navneet Ahluwalia and her supervisor, Mr. Mammody. The Examiner Interview was extremely cordial and appeared to be very productive as the Examiners appear to appreciate the distinctions presented between the pending claims and the art of record. The arguments presented during the interview of 05/23/2007 and the current response should obviate outstanding issues and make the pending claims allowable. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of this response/amendment.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

1. Claims 14-19 and 21-23 are pending.
2. Claims 14-19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Mohi et al. (US 2003/0195008 A1), hereafter Mohi, further in view of Raymond Anthony Joao (US 2002/0121969), hereafter Joao.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 14-19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Mohi et al. (US 2003/0195008 A1), hereafter Mohi, further in view of Raymond Anthony Joao (US 2002/0121969), hereafter Joao. To be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the combination of cited references (i.e., Mohi and Joao) should disclose all of the features of the rejected claims.

The present invention serves to protect information about a sought person from being unnecessarily disclosed, even to the search managers in charge of search of the sought person, by restrictively permitting disclosure of only the information that is currently required.

With respect to independent Claim 14's feature of "means for carrying out processing to make it impossible to refer to information concerning a sought person included in the operation instruction content stored in the storage section, in accordance with an instruction acquired from the instruction center", the Examiner has cited paragraphs 20 and 23 of Mohi as teaching such a feature. Applicant wishes to clarify, as was argued during the interview, that the cited paragraphs merely teach features usable in the controller such as "a history of the position of the rover, showing the height and velocity of the rover and other useful information".

Paragraph 59 of Mohi specifically expands on "useful information" as "controller unit to rover unit distance, rover unit velocity, rover unit height relative to the controller unit, the time at which the rover unit's data was ascertained and the rover unit's coordinate system location such as latitude, longitude and elevation." Applicants wish to clarify, as was argued during the interview, that such "useful information" CANNOT be interpreted to read on Applicants' feature of denying information concerning a sought person included in the operation instruction content stored in the storage area in accordance with an instruction acquired from the instruction center.

Further, with respect to claim 14, Mohi discloses in paragraph 116 that "Privacy and security should be considered so that only parents are allowed to search for their child, for example, by allowing the rover to respond only to a controller which sends the correct

password.” In other words, the rover in Mohi is not allowed to send information, but is only allowed to send information if a correct password is sent from the controller.

By stark contrast, in claim 14, information stored in an operation instructing terminal is accessible under normal circumstances, but access to the information is blocked if a previously set condition is satisfied by an instruction acquired from the center or the like.

Further, it should be noted that Mohi does not describe a process for limiting access to information which is stored in the controller after receiving it from the rover. Claim 14, in stark contrast, describes a process for limiting access to information stored in the operation instruction terminal based on a previously set condition.

It should also be noted that in Mohi, a third party, other than the rover and controller, cannot manage access to information. By stark contrast, according to claim 14, an instruction center, which is a third party other than the sought-after person and the operating instructing terminal can manage privacy of information stored in the operating instructing terminal.

With respect to independent Claim 15’s feature of “means for setting the search supporting devices to be capable of requesting the center side device for information concerning the sought person only when the search instruction is received”, the Examiner has cited paragraph 59 of Mohi as reading on such a feature. Claim 15 recites that control is performed to protect information about the sought person from being disclosed to searchers other than the selected search managers. Applicant wishes to clarify, as was argued during the interview, that

the above-detailed paragraph 59 merely details paragraph 23's "useful information" and makes NO mention of a device capable of requesting information concerning the sought person only when the search instruction is received.

Further, in Mohi, the controller can request information from the rover without any limitations, and the rover can determine whether to send the information in response to the request from the controller by authenticating the password. Accordingly, because multiple controllers can request information, any of the controllers can obtain information from the rover.

By contrast, in claim 15, only a search supporting apparatus which is selected by the center-side device to receive instructions can request information regarding a sought-after person. In other words, in the configuration of claim 15, the center selects and limits terminals which are allowed to request information.

Also, in Mohi, the third party cannot control who can search for the sought-after person and obtain private information through the search.

On the other hand, in claim 15, the center, which is a third party, can select a search manager from among multiple search staff. Accordingly, the center can control who is able to use the invention to search for the sought-after person, and who may obtain information from the rover.

With respect to independent Claims 16 and 19, Applicants wish to clarify, as was argued during the interview, that Joao's feature of utilizing a security code to access a device (as disclosed in Paragraphs 261 and 266) CANNOT be interpreted to read on Applicants' features of disclosable "security levels" wherein, as the search manager approaches closer to the sought person, sought person information having higher security levels are provided. Paragraphs 261 and 266, in Joao's own words, deal with denying "unauthorized access to the apparatus" and NOT with disclosing security levels based on a search manager approaching closer to the sought person.

Hence, at least for the reasons set forth above and the arguments presented during the Examiner Interview of 05/23/2007, Applicant respectfully contend that the combination of Mohi and Joao fail to teach many features of Applicant's pending independent claims 14, 15, 16, and 19. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection with respect to independent claims 14, 15, 16, and 19, and further respectfully requests allowance thereof.

The same arguments substantially apply to dependent claims 17-18 and 21-23, as they inherit all the features of the claim from which they depend. Allowance is also respectfully requested for dependent claims 14, 15, 16, and 19.


SUMMARY

As has been detailed above, none of the references, cited or applied, provide for the specific claimed details of Applicants' presently claimed invention, nor renders them obvious. It is believed that this case is in condition for allowance and reconsideration thereof and early issuance is respectfully requested.

This response has been filed with a 1-month extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies in the fees provided to Deposit Account No. 19-0079.

If it is felt that an interview would expedite prosecution of this application, please do not hesitate to contact Applicants' representative at the below number.

Respectfully submitted,



Matthew E. Connors
Registration No. 33,298
Gauthier & Connors LLP
225 Franklin Street, Suite 2300
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 426-9180
Extension: 112